

Remarks

1. Interview Summary

On September 1, 2011, the undersigned held a telephone interview with Examiner Michael Lai, at the request of the undersigned. During the interview, we discussed the claim amendments that are now submitted by this response, and the Examiner agreed that these amendments would appear to overcome the art of record. The Examiner indicated that he would update his search as required, and we expressed mutual hope that the case would be allowable considering the extensive and thorough examination that has spanned ten office actions.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his kind assistance.

2. Claim Amendments

Applicant is thus amending the claims as discussed during the interview. In particular, the amendments include the following, as supported by the specification:

- Each independent claim now recites that the web content is transmitted from the content server to the client station in response to a request from the client station. (The specification supports this, for instance, at pages 1-2, where the specification discusses a client sending a request and the server sending the content in response to the client, and at page 27, line 21 – page 35, line 5, and page 27, line 19 – page 38, line 3, where the specification discusses embellishing web content that is in a response in transit to the client station.)
- Each independent claim now recites that the method functions are carried out while the web content is in transit from the content server to the client station and has thus left the content server but has not yet arrived at the client station. (The specification supports this, for instance, at page 9, lines 20-28, where the specification discusses a client station sending a request for web content and a web server sending to the client station a response carrying the requested web content, at page 16, lines 7-14, where the specification describes an intermediation system sitting in the communication path, and responses carrying web content passing through the intermediation system on their way between the content server and the client station, and at page 18, lines 25-28, and page 37, line 29 – page 38, line 3, where the specification again discusses the content being "on its way" from the content server to the client station and thus passing through the intermediation system on its way.)

- Independent claim 4 adds a recitation of receiving the web content at an intermediation system in the communication path from the content server the client station. (The specification supports this, for instance, at page 37, lines 24-28, where the specification discusses the intermediation system receives a response that provides the web content. Note, in this regard, that the specification also makes clear that the intermediation system is considered to be "in the communication path" as long as at least the intermediation system's trigger logic resides there, but that it is possible that various enforcement logic such as interstitial communication functions may exist elsewhere such as in one or more external interstitial servers that may or may not themselves be within the communication path. *See, e.g.*, page 16, lines 19-24, and page 25, lines 3-7.)
- Each independent claims recite that an intermediation system carries out the various recited functions. (As noted above, the specification provides support for the intermediation sitting within the communication path and carrying out various intermediation functions, even if some functions such as interstitial communication are carried out externally by servers invoked in response to intermediary trigger logic in the communication path. Further, the specification provides additional support for recited functions being carried out by the intermediation system, for instance, at page 30, line 22 – page 35, line 5, and at page 37, line 19 – page 38, line 3.)
- New dependent claim 26, which depends from claim 4, adds that at least the "adding" function is carried out in an access channel. (The specification supports this, for instance, at page 16, lines 3-14, where the specification discusses the intermediation system being implemented in the access channel. *See also* original claims 14 and 17, describing example intermediation functions carried out in the access channel.)

Applicant submits that the claims, as narrowed and more particularly defined by these amendments, more clearly distinguish over the art of record and should therefore be allowed.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests favourable action.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case further, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2141.

Respectfully submitted,
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: September 6, 2011

By: /Lawrence H. Aaronson/
 Lawrence H. Aaronson
 Reg. No. 35,818